

# Report - IK2218 - 2023-01-02

Respondents: 1  
Answer Count: 1  
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

---

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

---

**Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):**

Peter Sjödin, psj@kth.se

---

**DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS**

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

Course evaluation was done with the standard LEQ (22 questions). 25/172 students participated.

---

**DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS**

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

No student meetings.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The course consists of lectures, four homework assignments, two labs, and a final written exam. For the first time, this year the exam was given as a digital exam in computer rooms. The exam was organised as four Canvas quizzes.

---

**THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

On the average, the student answers indicate that that the work load is less than the nominal 20 hours per week. Some students (6 of 25) responded that they spent more than 20 hours per week on the course. In the cases when the workload is perceived as high, it seems to be related mainly to the homework assignments.

---

**THE STUDENTS' RESULTS**

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

The results are satisfying, with 80% passing the course after the first re-exam. This is similar to previous years.

Results according to Ladok:

A: 17 (9.8%), B:49 (28.3%), C: 30 (17.3%), D: 6 (3.5%), E: 35 (20.2%), F: 36 (20.8%). Total 173.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Many comments are related to the homework assignments. They seem to be perceived as rewarding and good as preparations for the final exam, but also time-consuming. There are also some remarks that the first lab (TCP/UDP) is felt to be stressful.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The questionnaire shows the the course in general gets high scores. The students comment that the course is rewarding and useful. There are many positive comments about the lectures.

Some parts are getting lower scores, but this is consistent with the course design. In particular, the course steers the student into follow the planned path with regular deadlines for home works and labs, so there is no or little room for students to follow their own study patterns or influence the planning.

---

**OVERALL IMPRESSION**

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

On the whole, the course seems to be working well. That students are spending a significant amount of time on the homework assignments, and at the same time perceive the assignments as a good way to prepare for the exam, is a good sign and completely in line with the intentions behind the course design.

---

**ANALYSIS**

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
  - international and national students?
  - students with or without disabilities?
- 

There appear to be no particular concerns about the learning environment, and no significant differences can be identified between student categories.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

- Look into if homework assignments can be made less demanding without sacrificing outcomes.
  - Make lab 1 (TCP/UDP) less time-constrained.
- 

**OTHER INFORMATION**

Is there anything else you would like to add?

The introduction of a more extensive project in network programming was discussed at the course link meeting ("länkmöte") after the HT21 course. It was considered as something that would be a significant improvement and highly relevant for the course, but it needs further investigations as it would require a considerable course re-design.

---